



Jaw

**REPLY/AMENDMENT
FEE TRANSMITTAL**

Attorney Docket No.	10-008
Application Number	10/759,182
Filing Date	January 20, 2004
First Named Inventor	DUFFIE, III <i>et al.</i>
Group Art Unit	2141
Examiner Name	SERRAO, Ranodhi N

AMOUNT ENCLOSED

\$ 0

FEE CALCULATION (fees effective 12/08/2004)

CLAIMS AS AMENDED	Claims Remaining After Amendment	Highest Number Previously Paid For	Number Extra	Rate	Calculations
TOTAL CLAIMS	35	35	0 ⁽³⁾	X \$50.00 =	\$0
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS	4	4	0	X \$200.00 =	\$0
Since an Official Action set an <u>original</u> due date of ____, petition is hereby made for an extension to cover the date this reply is filed for which the requisite fee is enclosed (1 month (\$120); 2 months (\$450); 3 months (\$1020); 4 months (\$1590); 5 months (\$2160)):					
If Statutory Disclaimer under Rule 20(d) is enclosed, add fee (\$130)					+
Total of above Calculations =					\$0
Reduction by 50% for filing by small entity (37 CFR 1.9, 1.27 & 1.28)					-
TOTAL FEES DUE =					\$0

- (1) If entry (1) is less than entry (2), entry (3) is "0".
(2) If entry (2) is less than 20, change entry (2) to "20".
(4) If entry (4) is less than entry (5), entry (6) is "0".
(5) If entry (5) is less than 3, change entry (5) to "3".

METHOD OF PAYMENT

- [] Check enclosed as payment.
[] Charge "TOTAL FEES DUE" to the Deposit Account No., below.

AUTHORIZATION

- [X] If the above-noted "AMOUNT ENCLOSED" is not correct, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any additional fees under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 necessary to maintain pendency of the present application to:

Deposit Account No.:

50-1130

OrderNo.: (Client/Matter)

10-008

SUBMITTED BY: LEON R. TURKEVICH, ESQ.

Typed Name	Leon R. Turkevich	Reg. No.	34,035
Signature		Date	December 4, 2007



Docket No.: 10-008

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

DUFFIE, III *et al.*

Serial No.: 10/759,182

Filed: January 20, 2004

:
:
:
:
:
:

Group Art Unit: 2141

Examiner: SERRAO, Ranodhi N

For: ARRANGEMENT IN AN IP NODE FOR PRESERVING SECURITY-BASED
SEQUENCES BY ORDERING IP PACKETS ACCORDING TO QUALITY OF
SERVICE REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO ENCRYPTION

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Nonfinal Official Action mailed September 4, 2007, Applicant submits the following remarks.

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-22, 27-31, and 34-37 and 39-42 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 10, 18, 27, and 40-42 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,113 to Maeshima et al. and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0051130 by McLampy et al.. This rejection is respectfully traversed, as the rejection fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. As demonstrated below, the applied references fail to disclose or suggest the claimed features as argued in the rejection, and therefore fail to establish a rational basis for the

Response filed December 4, 2007
Appln. No. 10/759,182
Page 1